DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 380 JC 870 139

AUTHOR Hankin, Joseph N.
TITLE Affirmative Action and Inaction: The Status of Minorities and Women at Public Two-Year Colleges in New York State and the Nation. Rockefeller Institute Working Papers, Number 24, Fall 1986.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Albany. Nelson A. Rockefeller Inst. of Government.
PUB DATE Nov 86
NOTE 14p.
AVAILABLE FROM Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government, State University of New York, 411 State Street, Albany, NY 12203 ($1.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrators; *Affirmative Action; *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Compliance (Legal); Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Females; Minority Groups; *Minority Group Teachers; National Surveys; Statistical Data; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine the extent to which women and minorities were employed as administrators and faculty members at two-year colleges. State directors of two-year colleges and individual institutions provided data representing 770 public two-year colleges in 48 states. Study findings included the following: (1) the percentage of female and minority administrators rose from 25.66% in 1975 to 39.16% in 1983; (2) faculties showed a more modest increase from 39.23% in 1975 to 42.86% in 1983; (3) 145 public two-year community colleges had no minority administrators, 30 had no female administrators, and 21 had neither a minority nor a female administrator; (4) there were no minority faculty members at 63 campuses and no women faculty members at one college; (5) 23 of the colleges with no minority faculty members had no minority administrators either; and (6) although New York compared favorably to the rest of the nation in terms of the employment of female administrators and faculty, the state fell far short of national averages with respect to minorities. The study report includes recommendations for improving minority and female representation on two-year college faculties and administrations. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED279380

The Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government

State University of New York

Rockefeller Institute
Working Papers

Affirmative Action and Inaction: The Status of Minorities and Women at Public Two-Year Colleges in New York State and the Nation

Joseph N. Hankin
Westchester Community College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. N. Hankin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Number 24
Fall 1986

JC870139

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Rockefeller Institute Working Papers are dedicated to the widespread dissemination of scholarly works and research reports on issues of pertinence to New York State. The opinions expressed in this paper are solely those of the author and do not represent the views of the Rockefeller Institute of Government or the State University of New York.

Joseph N. Hankin is president of Westchester Community College. He received the B.A. degree in Social Sciences from City College of New York, the Master's in History from Columbia University, and the Doctor of Education in Administration of Higher Education from Columbia University.

$1.00

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND INACTION:

THE STATUS OF MINORITIES AND WOMEN AT PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES IN NEW YORK STATE AND THE NATION

Joseph N. Hankin

President, Westchester Community College

November 1986

"I've been to the mountain top . . .
and I've looked over and I've
seen the promised land."

—Martin Luther King

A Review

It has been more than a decade since American educational institutions began developing affirmative action policies to increase the number of qualified minority and female administrators and faculty. While we might expect that a decade of effort has resulted in some achievement, few data are available to evaluate that progress.

Few investigations, particularly, have examined the roles and concentrations of females and minorities in our two-year colleges. The American Association of University Professionals (AAUP) has provided some useful data, but these are limited to male-female breakdown. And the American Council on Education has provided a few more data on faculty and administrative concentrations. Examining college faculties, the council found 9.0 percent minorities, 26.0 percent female, and 32.0 percent minorities plus female. Of college administrators nationwide, the council found 10 percent minorities, 27.4 percent women, and 33.8 percent minorities plus women. (Note: the designation minority plus female does not double count minority females, therefore, while percentages do not appear to add up, they are actually accurate.) (American Council on Education, Office of Minority Concerns' Second Annual Status Report: *Minorities in Higher Education*, 1979.)

The college and university personnel association's report, *Women and Minorities in Administration of Higher Education Institutions: Employment Patterns and Salary Comparisons*, showed that little progress had been made between 1975 and 1979. In its survey of 1,222 institutions, the association found that 7.8 percent of the administrators were minorities, 19.7 percent were women, and 25.5 percent were minorities and women. These figures showed a slight increase over time. Of 307 two-year public colleges studied, 6.8 percent of the administrative position were filled by minorities, 21.0 were women, and 26.0 percent were minorities and women.

Two other sources are noteworthy: the 1979 and 1981 data reports from the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, based on biennial collection of statistics on EEO-6 forms. These are the federal forms distributed alternate years to all higher educational institutions under Public Law 88-352, title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972. A joint reporting committee represents three federal agencies: the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) of the Department of Education, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) of the Department of Labor, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).

These forms ask for employment data for full-and part-time employees by salary level, sex, minority group (white, black, Hispanic, Asian or Pacific Islander, and native American or Alaskan), and occupational position (faculty, administrative, professional nonfaculty, secretarial/clerical, technical/paraprofessional, skilled craft, and service/maintenance). The form also requires reports on "soft money" staff, foreign nationals,

new hires, and degree of faculty tenure. While they offer a wealth of data, they have been little used.

During the course of this study, the 1979 data and then the 1981 data were released by the joint committee. Despite federal plans to cut back in data collection and distribution, the 1983 data became available for all of higher education during 1985, but were not broken down in any way that compares two-year college information, according to James S. Neal of the survey division of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. While the results are useful, they offer no comparison of public and private, two-year and four-year institutions.

Method: Collecting New Data

To clarify the extent of women and minority employment on administrations and faculties of two-year institutions, I wrote to 40 state directors of public two-year colleges. After collating their responses, I wrote to all institutions for which data had not yet been gathered. This brought in data from 770 public two-year colleges in 48 states.

TABLE 1

Administrators—United States (Includes New York State)
(4 Year and 2 Year Colleges)

	1979 Study (N = 2881)		1981 Study (N = 3036)	
Group	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Male White	71,216	66.22	73,815	63.33
Male Black	4,876	4.53	4,755	4.08
Male Hispanic	1,100	1.02	1,367	1.17
Male API	639	0.59	773	0.66
Male AI/AN	245	0.23	370	0.32
Female White	25,535	23.74	31,014	26.61
Female Black	3,100	2.88	3,256	2.79
Female Hispanic	428	0.40	603	0.52
Female API	324	0.30	434	0.37
Female AI/AN	89	0.08	140	0.12
Total Minority	10,801	10.04	11,708	10.04
Total Female	29,476	27.41	35,447	30.41
Total Minority plus Female	36,336	33.78	42,712	36.64

Results

In this paper, Study 1 refers to institutions for which I received actual EEO-6 forms or reasonable equivalents. Study 2 refers to institutions for which I summarized similar data, but could not break down data in the exact categories as on the EEO-6. Specifically, I could not readily break out data regarding female administrators and faculty in Study 2.

Different studies use the term administrator somewhat differently. Therefore, the term administrator in this report is not always strictly equivalent to the category "executive/administrative/managerial" as found in the EEO-6 forms.

TABLE 2

Study Scope

	Public Two-year Colleges	Number Administrators	Number Faculty
Total in U.S.	1,054	16,519	104,223
Study 1	418	8,189	41,643
Study 2	352	6,120	31,145
Total in Study	770	14,309	72,788
% in Study	73.06	86.62	69.84

TABLE 3

Female and Minority Staff (Nationwide)

	Study 1	Study 2	Studies 1 & 2
Administrators			
Female	2,405 (29.37%)	N/A	N/A
Minority	1,256 (15.34%)	666 (10.88%)	1,922 (13.43%)
Female & Minority	3,207 (39.16%)	N/A	N/A
Faculty			
Female	15,240 (36.60%)	N/A	N/A
Minority	4,809 (12.23%)	2,548(8.18%)	7,357 (10.11%)
Female & Minority	17,849 (42.86%)	N/A	N/A

TABLE 4

Female and Minority Staff (New York State)
(Study 1 Data Only)

	Administrators	Faculty
Total in Study	796	5,167
Total Minority	48 (6.03%)	266 (5.15%)
Total Female	236 (29.65%)	1,955 (37.83%)
Total Minority plus Female	256 (32.16%)	N/A

After compiling my 1983 data, I compared them to 1975 data from an EEOC study of 1,134 two-year institutions.

TABLE 5

Administrators—United States (Includes New York State)
(2 Year Colleges)

Group	1975 Study* Number	% of Total	1983 Study Number	% of Total
Male White	12,150	74.34	4,982	60.84
Male Black	737	4.51	416	5.08
Male Hispanic	242	1.48	278	3.39
Male API	56	0.34	80	0.98
Male AI/AN	74	0.45	28	0.34
Female White	2,726	16.68	1,951	23.82
Female Black	267	1.63	306	3.74
Female Hispanic	43	0.26	86	1.05
Female API	26	0.16	46	0.56
Female AI/AN	22	0.13	16	0.20
Total Minority	1,467	8.98	1,256 **	15.34
Total Female	3,084	18.87	2,405	29.37
Total Minority plus Female	4,193	25.66	3,207	39.16

* These 1975 data are from the EEOC for 1,134 two-year institutions, but are not available for subsequent years.

** If data from Study 2 are included, this number would be 1,922, and the corresponding percentage would drop to 13.43.

A review of the findings shows a jump in the percent of female and minority administrators from 25.66 percent in 1975 to 39.16 percent in 1983. Faculty show a more modest increase from 39.23 percent in 1975 to 42.86 percent in 1983. Although these findings do not represent major progress in the recruitment of female and minority administrators and faculty, neither do they show slippage.

The findings also show that 145 public two-year community colleges have no minority administrators, and 30 have no female administrators (including 21 with neither a minority nor female administrator). At 63 campuses there were no minority faculty and one with no women faculty. Of the 63 with no minorities on faculty, 23 had no minority administrators.

No New York State data are available for 1975. Neither are data readily available to compare New York with other states. However, the findings do show that although New York compares favorably to the nation as a whole regarding female administrators and faculty, the state falls far short of national averages regarding minority administrators and faculty (Table 4).

As in most such analyses of secondary data, reporting variations require considerable interpretation. Some of the ambiguities that required interpretation included the following:

TABLE 6

Faculty—United States (Includes New York State)
(2 Year Colleges)

Group	1975 Study* Number	1975 Study* % of Total	1983 Study Number	1983 Study % of Total
Male White	53,127	60.77	23,794	57.14
Male Black	1,962	2.24	1,046	2.51
Male Hispanic	1,193	1.36	1,000	2.40
Male API	595	0.68	436	1.05
Male AI/AN	207	0.24	127	0.31
Female White	26,998	30.88	13,040	31.31
Female Black	2,318	2.65	1,204	2.89
Female Hispanic	589	0.67	574	1.38
Female API	345	0.39	356	0.85
Female AI/AN	96	0.11	66	0.16
Total Minority	7,305	8.35	4,809 **	11.55
Total Female	30,346	34.71	15,240	36.60
Total Minority plus Female	34,303	39.23	17,849	42.86

* These 1975 data are from the EEOC for 1,134 two-year institutions, but are not available for subsequent years.

** If data from Study 2 are included, this number would be 7,357, and the corresponding percentage would drop to 10.11.

- questions arose about full-time/part-time and other full time equivalent considerations, how to count campuses of colleges, and whether to include central offices;
- respondents often differed in their interpretations of definitions, even on standard EEO-6 forms;
- since Hispanics can be either black or white, black Hispanics might show up in the statistics as Hispanics;
- counselors and librarians were sometimes counted in the full-time faculty total;
- the ratio of administrators to faculty from institution to institution and from state to state varied a great deal.

Not enough data were collected from private two-year colleges or from four-year colleges to warrant any conclusions, but a similar study should be completed for comparative purposes.

From the Sources

Some of the anecdotal information collected is as telling as the data. Indeed, a number of illuminating comments from respondents came up during data collection. Some participants replicated inadequacies of the data:

One university administrator admitted: "I have not been able to locate a copy of the EEO-6 form filed last November which means that we were never requested to file one."

Another state administrative officer said: "In response to your letter regarding community college administrators, our office does not summarize the EEO-6 form data. In fact, we do not even receive a copy from our colleges. However, we are interested in receiving a copy of your report, as it sounds like it would be of interest."

Some explained or rationalized their institution's lack of progress:

A Midwestern assistant to the president said: "It is important that [our] data be reviewed in . . . proper context . . . The population of [our] district is [less than] 90,000 with minorities comprising only about two percent of the total. Thus, it is not surprising to find an absence of minority administrators at the college."

Another added confidentially: "[Our] suburban community college . . . tends to be predominantly Caucasian which is a reflection on the makeup of our community. [But] I would certainly appreciate your keeping this [statement] confidential."

On a more positive note, a Midwest administrator said: "Our experience has been rewarding and is the consequence of the administration of a strong affirmative action policy and the implementing procedures. Moreover, our program has been characterized by officials . . . as perhaps the most effective affirmative action program in higher education in all of [the] region . . . It seems quite clear that talented minorities are available and can be very effective in an environment of inclusion."

A representative from a suburban institution complained though: "Although we have conducted full affirmative action searches for two administrative positions this year, no qualified minority candidates were discovered."

A west coast affirmative action officer provided encouragement for aspiring minority administrators: "[We] just had a conference on encouraging minorities into the educational system. At that conference our president . . . indicated that finding a . . . minority role model . . . already successful in [his or her] career and having that person express faith and confidence in him was one of the most crucial factors in his progress towards success."

Another west coast administrator advises: "My best advice to minority administrators is the same as for anyone else. Get the education, the advanced degrees, and appropriate experience, and the opportunities will be there."

A Look at Minority Students

A discussion of women and minorities on faculties and administrations would not be complete without a mention of students. The students of today are the faculty and administrators of tomorrow. Minority students can become minority faculty and administrators.

Sandy Astin's *Minorities in American Higher Education* discusses the educational "pipeline," illustrating how the supply narrows after each educational stride: high school graduation, college graduation, graduate school, etc. Susan Berryman documented this lost ground in her 1983 article: In 1972 blacks represented 12.7 percent of all 18-year-olds, 10.5

percent of all 1972 high school graduates, 8.7 percent of all 1972 college freshmen, and four years later, 6.5 percent of all bachelors' degree recipients. By 1979, blacks represented only about 4 percent of all professional and doctoral degree recipients.

Other reports, too, show slippage rather than gain. For example, in 1980, according to the National Research Council, well over half of the 1,095 doctorates awarded to blacks were in education and the social sciences; only 18 were in engineering and 12 in mathematics. For 1983, the total had dropped to 1,000, and while engineering recipients had increased to 29, the number of doctorates in mathematics had dropped to 3.

Kenneth Clark, who had figured so prominently into the famous *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision of 1954, reported the grim history to an audience at Westchester Community College: In the 30 years since the landmark decision, he claimed he had seen not gains but losses in many areas. In 1985, 63 percent of American minority school children still attend predominantly minority schools. The income level of a child's family is still the major determinant of his or her educational quality.

More recently, Linda Darling-Hammond of the College Board completed a monograph for the College Entrance Examination Board, entitled *Equality and Excellence: The Educational Status of Black Americans*.

> Although high school graduation rates have improved dramatically for black students over the past two decades, college attendance and completion rates have declined for blacks since 1975. Blacks are seriously underrepresented among graduate and professional school students, and black participation rates in postgraduate education have declined since the early 1970's.

A New York State financial aid publication recently stated: "Statistics from the census bureau show [that] the proportion of black students (18-24 years old) who go to college dropped from 20.7 percent in 1975 to 19.4 percent in 1980; Hispanic students dropped from 20.4 percent to 16.1 percent."

It would seem that many needy students have less access to financial aid information. Yet, according to Darling-Hammond, "the importance of financial aid for black students is apparent, considering that in 1981, 48 percent of black college-bound seniors came from families with incomes under $12,000, as compared to only 10 percent of their white counterparts." In a study released in 1985, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) found a sharp drop in minority students receiving student aid—a decline of 12.4 percent in 1983-84 from two years earlier.

Conclusion

We have come a long way since August 1935 when the Georgia Board of Education ordered all its black teachers to resign from the NAACP or have their teaching licenses revoked. We have seen progress since Booker T. Washington exclaimed, "You can't hold a man down without staying down with him."

After all, 294 colleges have named female presidents, compared to 148 in 1975. In the two-year college field, the figures have more than doubled from 45 to 120. And the number of black presidents has risen from 32 in 1979 to 58 today. A recent study of senior women administrators in higher education found a 90 percent increase—from 1,625 in 1975 to 3,084 in

1983. Of 106 California colleges, 47 percent had one or more Hispanic administrators, including 5 presidents.

In addition, black/white test score gaps have narrowed, and black scores on SAT verbal and math subtests have improved. In September of 1985 the National Assessment of Educational Progress issued its "reading report card," which found that black and Hispanic students had made dramatic progress from 1971 to 1984, and inner city schools had improved. In the period from 1976 to 1981, the number of associate degrees awarded to blacks increased from 26,000 per year to 34,000, and it is said that 51 percent of black students continuing their educations after high school are enrolled in two-year colleges. Other statistics, however, show that the gains have not been great enough. Moreover, critics of the two-year colleges feel that they have not been retaining enough of the minority group students they attract.

However, we must not lose sight of the fact that gains have been uneven, and that there have been some slippages. In the same National Assessment of Educational Progress report, we learn that despite the progress reported, 17-year-old black and Hispanic students still read only at the level of 13-year-old whites, and that there was almost no progress for students in advantaged urban schools from 1971 to 1984.

Above all, we must not expect monodimensional solutions to multidimensional problems. We must expand on a number of fronts at once.

Several years ago, Dr. Richard J. Ernst, chancellor of Northern Virginia Community College, wrote an article, "Women in Higher Education Leadership Positions—It Doesn't Happen by Accident." One might amend his title to include "women and minorities." Extrapolating from Ernst's article, there are a number of ways that institutions can improve their affirmative action status:

Well established turnover rates provide opportunity to employ females and minorities. When vacancies occur, clearly, an institution must recognize what kind of administrator it wants, then go out and search to find the best candidates. To ensure progress, an institution should try to fill as many positions as possible with minority and female candidates.

An institution must not expect that all candidates will have all the requisite experience, rather it must look for talent and skills, and sometimes take a chance by projecting individual growth and development. Regardless, the institution must make sure that it is selecting competency and capability first, rather than race or sex. This is not only critical when the candidate selected is a female or minority, but also when the candidate is white male. Individuals must be selected for competency and potential not for tokenism or to satisfy affirmative action requirements.

On the job, all administrators should be treated alike. One must never make racial distinctions. An institution should involve all of its administrators in the partnership of running the institution: In this way, the institution is training talent and providing experiences for administrators to advance regardless of race or sex. And other administrators must serve as role models themselves, as well as mentors.

Many statewide boards lack (or believe they lack) affirmative action responsibility. (Twelve states in this study responded that they did not collect such data.) This must be clarified.

Our institutions must be committed to the goal of equal employment opportunity. A carefully developed affirmative action plan, including mechanisms for implementation and regular reports on progress, must be devised.

If we must rely on white males to recruit and interview prospective minority students, then we must work on getting more female and minority alumni to do their parts.

If we anticipate that minority groups will make up the majority of the populations of more than 50 major cities by 2000, then we must begin to work on increasing political power for those groups.

If we have too few minority administrators, then we must devise ways of attracting and retaining more minority faculty members.

If the number of minority students completing the various endpoints is slipping, we must devote time and attention to strengthening retention.

We must provide mentors and role models, networks, and nurturing climates. Programs like New Jersey's Hispanic leadership fellows program help able and aspiring female and minority group members to become administrators. We must support this kind of program.

If housing, employment, and education are intertwined as social problems, we must use our resources in appropriate ways to work on all these problems at the same time.

We must remember, as Kenneth Clark has reminded us: "Education in the broadest sense is a critically important vehicle by which social problems are identified and ultimately overcome."

Perhaps the following anecdote puts the picture in perspective: A young black boy was watching the balloon man at a country fair when a purple balloon broke loose and soared up and out of sight. The incident commanded a lot of attention, and the vendor, thinking it might be good business to release another, snipped the string of a green balloon, then a white one. The boy watched intently and then asked: "If you sent up the black one up, would it go as high as the others?" The balloon man released the black balloon and said, "It's not the color, it's the stuff inside that makes it rise." We have an obligation to assist that process.

Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government
State University of New York
411 State Street
Albany, New York 12203
(518) 472-1300

For a complete list of Rockefeller Institute publications contact:

Marketing and Public Relations Department
Rockefeller Institute of Government
411 State Street
Albany, New York 12203
(518) 472-1300

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges
APR 17 1987